

REMARKS

Claims 5 and 10 have been canceled. Claims 1, 6-7, 11-12, and 19-20 have been amended to clarify the subject matter regarded as the invention. Claims 1-4, 6-9, and 11-20 are pending.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-20 under 35 USC §112, §102(e), or §103(a).

The rejection is respectfully traversed. With regard to the rejections under 35 USC 112, the Office Action asserts that the term “display” is used to mean “feedback or output” while the accepted meaning is “to show visually” and that the term is indefinite because the specification does not clearly redefine the term. However, the recited “non-visual display device” is defined clearly in the present application, including without limitation on page 11, lines 1-28, of the specification, to mean a device configured to provide output perceivable by one or more human senses other than sight. Audio devices, such as speakers configured to render audio output, and haptic devices configured to render tactile or other haptic output are described as illustrative examples of such a “non-visual display device”. As the Federal Circuit recently affirmed, applicants are not required to use any particular or formal language to act as their own lexicographers. Astrazeneca AB v. Mutual Pharmaceutical Co., 72 USPQ2d 1726 (Fed. Cir. 2004). Therefore, the claims when read in light of the specification are believed to be sufficiently definite with respect to the recited “non-visual display device”, and on that basis the rejection under 35 USC 112 is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites an “interface for facilitating browsing of an indexed collection of electronic content” by “determining a current location within an index associated with the indexed collection of electronic content”. Rhie teaches accessing and browsing the internet through the use of a telephone via a voice browser and the DTMF signals generated from a

telephone keypad. Rhie does not teach browsing an indexed collection of electronic content via an index associated with the indexed collection of electronic content and instead describes browsing directly an un-indexed body of content. As such, claim 1 is believed to be allowable over Rhie.

Rhie in addition does not describe a “location display resolution controlling device for controlling the resolution with which the information identifying the current location is displayed by the non-visual display device; and a non-visual resolution feedback device for providing non-visual feedback representative of a current resolution with which the information identifying the current location currently is being displayed by the non-visual display device,” as recited in claim 1. The recited limitations are supported in the specification without limitation on page 13, line 14, to page 14, line 28, as well as on page 17, line 34, to page 18, line 9. Claim 1 is believed to be allowable over Rhie for this additional and independently sufficient reason.

Weiser teaches a single button scrolling system for presenting data in visual displays of limited size in which data is presented to a user in a manner dependent on the length of time the button is depressed. Weiser does not teach a *non-visual* resolution feedback device for providing non-visual feedback representative of the current resolution. As noted above, Rhie does not describe a resolution control or associated feedback. As such, claim 1 is believed to be allowable over Rhie and Weiser combined.

Claims 2-4, 6-9, and 11-18 depend from claim 1 and are believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

Claims 19-20 also recite “browsing of an indexed collection of electronic content” by “determining a current location within an index associated with the indexed collection of electronic content” and “controlling the resolution with which the information identifying the current location is displayed by the non-visual display device with a location display resolution controlling device; and providing non-visual feedback representative of a current resolution with which the information identifying the current location currently is being displayed by the non-visual display device with a non-visual resolution feedback device”. Therefore, claims 19-20 are believed to be allowable for the reasons described above.

Reconsideration of the application and allowance of all claims are respectfully requested based on the preceding remarks. If at any time the Examiner believes that an interview would be helpful, please contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 2/28/05

William J. James

William J. James
Registration No. 40,661
V 408-973-2590
F 408-973-2595

VAN PELT, YI & JAMES LLP
10050 N. Foothill Blvd., Suite 200
Cupertino, CA 95014

Application Serial No. 09/918,681

Attorney Docket No. INT1P905C1